**Order** 

Michigan Supreme Court Lansing, Michigan

October 26, 2007

134214 & (52)

AMERICAN FAMILY ASSOCIATION OF MICHIGAN,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

Clifford W. Taylor, Chief Justice

Michael F. Cavanagh Elizabeth A. Weaver Marilyn Kelly Maura D. Corrigan Robert P. Young, Jr. Stephen J. Markman, Justices

SC: 134214 COA: 273997

Ingham CC: 06-000830-CZ

V

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES,

Defendant-Appellee,

and

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONALS ASSOCIATION MEA/NEA, and CLERICAL-TECHNICAL UNION OF MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY,

Intervening Defendants-Appellees.

\_\_\_\_\_/

On order of the Court, the motion for immediate consideration is GRANTED. The application for leave to appeal the June 12, 2007 judgment of the Court of Appeals is considered, and it is DENIED, because we are not persuaded that the question presented should be reviewed by this Court.

CAVANAGH and KELLY, JJ., would grant leave to appeal to consider the standing issue.

WEAVER, J., would grant leave to appeal and states as follows:

I would grant plaintiff's application for leave to appeal to reconsider Lee v Macomb Co Bd of Comm'rs, Nat'l Wildlife Federation v Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co, 2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Lee v Macomb Co Bd of Comm'rs, 464 Mich 726 (2001).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Nat'l Wildlife Federation v Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co, 471 Mich 608 (2004).

Rohde v Ann Arbor Pub Schools,<sup>3</sup> and Michigan Citizens for Water Conservation v Nestlé Waters North America Inc.<sup>4</sup> These erroneously decided cases created new standing law in Michigan that denies Michigan citizens access to the courts. Lee, Nat'l Wildlife, Rohde, and Michigan Citizens represent examples of judicial activism by the majority of four justices of this Court (Chief Justice Taylor and Justices Corrigan, Young, and Markman).

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Michigan Citizens for Water Conservation v Nestlé Waters North America Inc, 479 Mich 280 (2007).



 $I,\ Corbin\ R.\ Davis,\ Clerk\ of\ the\ Michigan\ Supreme\ Court,\ certify\ that\ the$  foregoing is a true and complete copy of the order entered at the direction of the Court.

October 26, 2007



t1023

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Rohde v Ann Arbor Pub Schools, 479 Mich 336 (2007).